UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/820,339	03/29/2001	Sara Fuchs	FUCHS=2A	3100

1444 7590 09/30/2002

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
624 NINTH STREET, NW
SUITE 300
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303

EXAMINER
HAYES, ROBERT CLINTON

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1647	9

DATE MAILED: 09/30/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Offic Action Summary	Application No. 09/820,339	Applicant(s) FUCHS ET AL.	
	Examiner Robert Hayes	Art Unit 1647	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover she t with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 December 2001* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Pri rity under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1-7 and 20, drawn to a polypeptide capable of modulating the autoimmune response of an individual to acetylcholine receptor and pharmaceutical compositions comprising the same, classified in class 514, subclass 2, for example.

II. Claims 8-19, drawn to a method of producing a polypeptide comprising a DNA molecule, vectors, and cells comprising the same, classified in class 435, subclass 69.1, for example.

III. Claim 21, drawn to a method for alleviating and/or treating myasthenia gravis, comprising administering to an individual in need thereof an effective amount of a polypeptide, classified in class 514, subclass 2, for example.

IV. Claim 22, drawn to a method for diagnosing myasthenia gravis comprising determining anti-AchR antibody titer, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1, for example.

2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

3. Although there are no provisions under the section for "Relationship of Inventions" in M.P.E.P. § 806.05 for inventive Inventions that are directed to <u>different</u> methods, restriction is deemed to be proper because these methods appear to constitute patentably distinct inventions for the following reasons: Inventions II, III, and IV are directed to methods that are distinct both

physically and functionally, and are not required one for the other. Invention II requires search and consideration of producing a polypeptide, which is not required by any of the other Inventions. Invention III requires search and consideration of alleviating and/or treating myasthenia gravis, which is not required by any of the other Inventions. Invention IV requires search and consideration of diagnosing myasthenia gravis comprising determining anti-AchR antibody titer, which is not required by any of the other Inventions.

4. Inventions II and I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the polypeptide of Invention I could be made by materially different processes such as chemical synthesis or isolation and purification from natural sources.

5. Inventions I and each of III and IV are related as product and processes of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the processes for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. The polypeptide of Invention I can be used to isolate receptors.

6. FURTHERMORE, restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

A. Claims 1-22, each in part, as the inventions pertain to SEQ ID NO: 1.

B. Claims 1-22, each in part, as the inventions pertain to SEQ ID NO: 2.

C. Claims 1-22, each in part, as the inventions pertain to SEQ ID NO: 5.

D. Claims 1-22, each in part, as the inventions pertain to SEQ ID NO: 6.

E. Claims 1-22, each in part, as the inventions pertain to SEQ ID NO: 7.

F. Claims 1-22, each in part, as the inventions pertain to SEQ ID NO: 8.

7. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

8. Although there are no provisions under the section for "Relationship of Inventions" in M.P.E.P. § 806.05 for inventive Inventions that are directed to different products, restriction is deemed to be proper because these products appear to constitute patentably distinct inventions for the following reasons: Inventions A, B, C, D, E, and F are directed to sequences that are distinct both physically and functionally, and are not required one for the other. Invention A requires search and consideration of SEQ ID NO: 1, which is not required by any of the other Inventions. Invention B requires search and consideration of SEQ ID NO: 2, which is not required by any of the other Inventions. Invention C requires search and consideration of SEQ ID NO: 5, which is not required by any of the other Inventions. Invention D requires search and consideration of SEQ ID NO: 6, which is not required by any of the other Inventions. Invention E requires search and consideration of SEQ ID NO: 7, which is not required by any of the other Inventions. Invention F requires search and consideration of SEQ ID NO: 8, which is not required by any of the other Inventions. Each sequence requires a separate search of the literature

and sequence databases. A search and examination of an Invention as it pertains to all sequences would therefore present the examiner with an undue search burden.

9. Applicant is advised that this is not a requirement to elect a species. Rather, this is a second restriction requirement superimposed upon the requirement to elect one group from I-IV. In order to be fully responsive, Applicant must elect one group from I-IV and one group from A-F.

10. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, separate search requirements, and/or different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

11. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Hayes whose telephone number is 703-305-3132. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:30AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Kunz, Ph.D. can be reached on 703-308-4623. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-872-9307 for After Final communications. The fax phone numbers for the customer service center is 703-872-9305.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.

CJN
September 27, 2002

Gary J. Kunz
GARY KUNZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600